



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,681	09/26/2005	Jerachmiel (Yori) Appelbaum	090-ATH	8344
40591	7590	08/20/2009		
HAIM FACTOR Ofek Group Inc. 16192 Coastal Highway Lewes, DE 19958			EXAMINER PACKARD, BENJAMIN J	
			ART UNIT 1612	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 08/20/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

HAIM.FACTOR@1ST-TECH-IDEAS.COM  
haim.factor@ofekgroup.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/550,681	<b>Applicant(s)</b> APPELBAUM, JERACHMIEL (YORI)	
	<b>Examiner</b> Benjamin Packard	<b>Art Unit</b> 1612	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Benjamin Packard. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Patrick Waller. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 August 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 44-56.

Identification of prior art discussed: Carter et al and Krajewska et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached.    g) ☒ was not reached.    h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the 112 rejections, which Applicant suggested possible amendments which Examiner will consider upon filing to overcome the rejected terms. Also discussed the 103 rejection, where Applicants believe the Carter et al is inapplicable to the instant invention. Examiner suggested an interpretation which reads on the instant claims and Applicants will consider the various interpretations and respond accordingly.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Benjamin Packard/ Examiner, Art Unit 1612	/Frederick Krass/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612
---	---